APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,944	11/18/2003	L. Keith Lipman	INWO0053	7265

22862   7590   03/17/2008
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/716,944	LIPMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T. Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or
> composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor,
> subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims lack the necessary
physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning
of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are
they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they
fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material
per se.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that the combination of Schutt and Panichkul does not teach

"wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved

queries are browser-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and

wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Schutt teaches queries are associated with

folders and documents (paragraph 0103). Panichkul teaches user queries are saved in

a memory. After a user select a query and sending the search query to Web browser

server, the search results are detected and displayed upon a user display. The above

information shows that after the user selects saved queries in the memory are browser-able and can be re-executed at user's selection. Memory is represented as master file (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 45-60; col. 8, lines 30-53).

Applicant argued that the combination of Panichkul and Panichkul does not teach "wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browser-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders". Panichkul teaches user's querires are associated with documents and folders. User's needs are not saved queries (abstract).

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Schutt teaches queries are associated with folders and documents (paragraph 0103). Panichkul teaches user queries are saved in a memory. After a user select a query and sending the search query to Web browser server, the search results are detected and displayed upon a user display. The above information shows that after the user selects saved queries in the memory are browser-able and can be re-executed at user's selection. Memory is represented as master file (fig. 5, col. 3, lines 45-60; col. 8, lines 30-53).

For the above reason, Examiner believes that the combination of cited references for 103 rejection of claim is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kitamura (20030163490) in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul")

(US 6775537).

As to claim 1, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitations:

"means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder

corresponding to a document type" as (paragraphs [0018, 0024]);

"an attribute assignment component to automatically create metadata data fields

for a new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields

appropriate for the document type" as (paragraph [0020-0021]).

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as user's

need are associated with documents and folders. User's needs are not saved queries

(abstract).

Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a search component

wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved

queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and

wherein saved queries"

Panichkul teaches storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Panichkurs teaching storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Kitamura's system in order to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process.

As to claim 2, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitation "an metadata copying logic to automatically fill in the metadata fields which correspond to metadata fields in a parent folder" as (fig. 14).

As to claim 16, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitations:

"having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up a matter file including a plurality of folders" as (paragraphs [0065-0069]), each folder corresponding to a document type" as (paragraphs [0024-0025]));

"setting up a matter file in response to a user request, the matter file including the plurality of folders" as (paragraphs [0020-0021]);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as (paragraph [0020-0021]);

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as user's

need are associated with documents and folders. User's needs are not saved queries

(abstract).

Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "saving user-formulated

search .queries to said matter file, wherein said Saved queries are browse-able and can

be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and saved queries; wherein saved

queries"

Panichkul teaches storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved

query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Panichkurs teaching storing search queries in a

memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Kitamura's system in

order to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of

maintaining and tracking.persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of

the search process.

As to claim 17, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitations "the document

inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into which the

document is filed" as (paragraphs [0069; 0065]).

As to claim 18, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the inherited

metadata is inferred" as (paragraphs [0069; 0065]).

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura

in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in

view of Shutt.

As to claim 3, Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a security

logic to assign a security level to the document, the security level corresponding to a

security level of a parent folder". Shutt teaches security level corresponding to a security

level of folder (pargraph 0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Shutt's teaching of security level corresponding to a

security level of folder to Kitamura's system in order to protect folder from modifying

folder without permission.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura

in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view

of Linsey et al (or hereinafter "Linsey"(US 7127676).

As to claim 4, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitation "a matter creation logic to

create a new matter folder, and to create a plurality of folders within the new matter

folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph 0012 & 0024).

Kitamura does not teach "the matter creation comprising: matter type logic to receive a

matter type selection from a user". Linsey teaches creating a folder based on a user

selection of a folder type (col. 12, lines 55-67; col. 13, lines 1-10).

It would have been. obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Linsey's teaching of creating a folder based on a user selections of a folder type to Kitamura's system in order to allow a user to choice a correct folder type for storing a corresponding document type correctly.

8. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view of Huang.

As to claim 5, Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation teaches the claimed limitation "a work list logic to receive a list of users for the new matter folder, and to add the new matter folder to a My Matters folder for the list of users". Huang teaches adding folders to another folder (col. 8, lines 55-67; col. 9, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Huang's teaching of adding folders to another folder to Kitamura's system in order to update the information in folder.

9. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email interface to generate an email address for the matter folder, the email address to

receive emails and file them in a correspondence folder in the matter, folder".
Robertson teaches creating an email address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for a database, the email address to receives emails and file to of Kitamura's system to allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string". Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string (col. 8, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address as a unique string to Kitamura's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to access a user's address book without permission.

10. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view of Barnett (US 6369840).

As to claim 8, Kitamura does not explicitly teach "wherein the subscription ....includes the matter file in the user's My Matter list".

Barnett teaches the user can select individual event categories and/or subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View 314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages 313-315 (col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Kitamura's system in order to update a user profile or file.

As to claim 10, Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "where the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to another user's subscription list and the user may be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Kitamura's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

11. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Barnett and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 9, Kitamura does not explicilty teach the claimed limitation "wherein the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to a matter file at a second level, wherein the subscription includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (col. 8, lines 35-55). Robertson teaches modify record and put the modified record in a user record (col. 3, lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Roberson's teaching to Kitamura's system in order to share information of a user to another user.

12. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and

further in view of Funk et al (or hereinafter "Funk") US 20030115270 A1.

As to claim 11, Kitamura does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an

email logic to file emails in an appropriate matter file" as (fig. 14). Funk teaches there is

also a file for low priority emails being sent to AOL (file 311). Likewise, there is a folder

for high priority emails being sent to Yahoo (file 312), a destination with a fast Receiving

MTA, and low priority emails being sent to Yahoo (file 313).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Funk's teaching to Kitamura's system to store emails

in a file for sending to another file or system.

13. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and

further in view of Rothkop (Us 2002/0049727).

As to claim 12, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitation "the email logic to prompt

a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder".Rothkop teaches field 740

provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the

user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by

clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Kitamura's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

14. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al'(or hereinafter "Panichkul")(US 6775537) and further in view of Mccotter.

As to claim 13, Kitamura does not explicity teach the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of he matter file". Mccotter teaches arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mccotter's teaching of arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file to Kitamura's system in order to search documents in files of a folder quickly.

15. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into an ontology based on attributes of the matter file". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child

relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each objectbeing either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to Kitamura's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15, Kitamura teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a refiling logic to simplify moving a plurality of objects into a matter folder by propagating the metadata to each of the objects in a hierarchical manner". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child

relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a

child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent

object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent

object to Kitamura's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy

of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a

hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

16.   Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over.Shutt (US 2003/0217034) in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US

6775537).

As to claim 1, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations:

"means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder

corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph [0166], lines 1-10);

"an attribute assignment logic to automatically create metadata data fields for a

new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields

appropriate for the document type" as (figs. 22-23, paragraph [0084], paragraph

[0129-0130]);

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as queries are associated with documents and folders. Theses queries are not saved queries (paragraph 0103).

Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a search component wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and saved queries"

Panichkul teaches storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Panichkul's teaching storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Shutt's system in order to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process.

As to claim 2, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "an metadata copying logic to automatically fill in the metadata fields which correspond to metadata fields in a parent folder" as (figs. 14 & 27, paragraph [0136]).

As to claim 3, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a security logic to assign a security level to the document, the security level corresponding to a security level of a parent folder" as (paragraph [0170]).

As to claim 5, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a work list logic to receive a list of users for the new matter folder, and to add the new matter folder to a My Matters folder for the list of users" as (fig. 27).

17. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Linsey et al (or hereinafter "Linsey"(US 7127676)

As to claim 4, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a matter creation logic to create a new matter folder, and to create a plurality of folders within the new matter folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph 901660). Shutt does not teach "the matter creation comprising: matter type logic to receive a matter type selection from a user". Linsey teaches creating a folder based on a user selection of a folder type (col. 12, lines 55-67; col. 13, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Estrada's teaching of creating a folder based on a user selections of a folder type to Shutt's system in order to allow a user to choice a correct folder type for storing a corresponding document type correctly.

18. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email interface to generate an email address for the matter folder, the email address to

receive emails and file them in a correspondence folder in the matter folder". Robertson teaches creating an email address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for a database, the email address to receives emails and file to Shutt's system to allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string". Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string (col. 8, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address as a unique string to Shutt's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to access a user's address book without permission.

19. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Barnett (US 6369840).

As to claim 8, Shutt does not explicitly teach "wherein the subscription .... includes the matter file in the user's My Matter list".

Barnett teaches the user can select individual event categories and/or

subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event

category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite

Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View

314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from

the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The user can also

access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add or remove

categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages 313-315 (col. 8,

lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Shutt's system in order to update

a user profile or file.

As to claim 10, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "where the

subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to another user's subscription list and the

user may be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members inthe

group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it.

Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group

(col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group

calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can

access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be

specified for different member members of the group to Shutt's system in order to

allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a

security level access.

20. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in

view of of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view

of Barnett and Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 9, Shutt does not explicilty teach the claimed limitation "wherein the

subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to a matter file at a second level, wherein

the subscription includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (col. 8,

lines 35-55).

Robertson teaches modify record and put the modified record in a user record

(col. 3, lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Roberson's teaching to Shutt's system in order to

share information of a user to another user.

21. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt

in view of of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in

view of Funk et al (or hereinafter "Funk") (US 20030115270 A1).

As to claim 11, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email logic to file emails in an appropriate matter file" as (fig. 14).

Funk teaches there is also a file for low priority emails being sent to AOL (file 311). Likewise, there is a folder for high priority emails being sent to Yahoo (file 312), a destination with a fast Receiving MTA, and low priority emails being sent to Yahoo (file 313). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Funk's teaching to Shutt's system to store emails in a file for sending to another file or system.

22. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of Rothkop (Us 2002/0049727).

As to claim 12, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "the email logic to prompt a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder".

Rothkop teaches field 740 provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the t~me the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Shutt's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

23. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view of Mccotter.

As to claim 13, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file". Mccotter teaches arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mccotter's teaching of arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file to Shutt's system in order to search documents in files of a folder quickly.

24. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into an ontology based on attributes of the matter file". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child, object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to Shutt's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a refiling logic to simplify moving a plurality of objects into a matter folder by propagating the metadata to each of the objects in a hierarchical manner". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent obiect to Shutt's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of

the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp, the relationship any object in a

hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

25. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shutt in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and

Dougherty et al (or hereinafter "Dougherty") (US 2002/0169650).

As to claim 16, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations: "a matter file including a

plurality of folders; each folder corresponding to a document type; setting up a matter

file in response to a user request, the matter file including the plurality of folders" as

(paragraphs [0020-0021]);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of

the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the

document type" as (figs. 22-23, paragraph [0084], paragraph [0129-0130]).

Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "having a plurality of

templates, each template designed to set up; a search component wherein user-

formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are

browser-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein

saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders".

Panichkul teaches storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved

query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

Dougherty teaches library templates, each template designed to set up a file (paragraphs [0191-0192]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Dougherty teaches library templates, each template designed to set up a file and Panichkul teaching of storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Shutt's system in order to a user to create folder structures for association with a deal, a schedule of at least one meeting relating to a deal, and minutes from each meeting in order so that a user can search/retrieve information in folders easily and quickly and to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process (col. 4, lines 1-30).

As to claim 17, Shutt and Dougherty disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, Dougherty further teaches the claimed limitations "the document inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into which the document is filed" as (paragraph [0193]).

As to claim 18, Shutt and Dougherty disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, Dougherty further teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the inherited metadata is inferred" as (paragraph [0193]).

26.   Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over.Shutt (US 2003/0217034) in view of Haahr et al (or hereinafter "Haahr") (US

20050055341).

As to claim 1, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations:

"means for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder

corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph [0166], lines 1-10);

"an attribute assignment logic to automatically create metadata data fields for a

new document, when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields

appropriate for the document type" as (figs. 22-23, paragraph [0084], paragraph [0129-

0130]);

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as queries

are associated with documents and folders. Theses queries are not saved queries

(paragraph 0103).

Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a search component

wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved

queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and

saved queries".

Haahr teaches storing user query strings in a database (fig. 1). A user selects a

query and user will search documents using the previous queries (paragraph 0062, fig.

8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Haahr's teaching to Shutt's system in

order to improve a user's current query, and allow a user to benefit and learn from

previous queries having the same search results, users also learn from these previous

queries by being able to accurately articulate more powerful queries, thus become more

experienced with the art successful searching.

As to claim 2, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "an metadata copying logic to

automatically fill in the metadata fields which correspond to metadata fields in a parent

folder" as (figs. 14 & 27, paragraph [0136]).

As to claim 3, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a security logic to assign a

security level to the document, the security level corresponding to a security level of a

parent folder" as (paragraph [0170]).

As to claim 5, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a work list logic to receive a

list of users for the new matter folder, and to add the new matter folder to a My Matters

folder for the list of users" as (fig. 27).

27. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in

view of Haahr and further in view of Linsey et al (or hereinafter "Linsey"(US 7127676)

As to claim 4, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "a matter creation logic to

create a new matter folder, and to create a plurality of folders within the new matter

folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (paragraph 901660). Shutt

does not teach "the matter creation comprising: matter type logic to receive a matter

type selection from a user". Linsey teaches creating a folder based on a user selection of a folder type (col. 12, lines 55-67; col. 13, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Estrada's teaching of creating a folder based on a user selections of a folder type to Shutt's system in order to allow a user to choice a correct folder type for storing a corresponding document type correctly.

28. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email interface to generate an email address for the matter folder, the email address to receive emails and file them in a correspondence folder in the matter folder". Robertson teaches creating an email address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines 10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for a database, the email address to receives emails and file to Shutt's system to allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string". Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string (col. 8, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address as

a unique string to Shutt's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to access a

user's address book without permission.

29. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Barnett (US 6369840).

As to claim 8, Shutt does not explicitly teach "wherein the subscription ....

includes the matter file in the user's My Matter list".

Barnett teaches the user can select individual event categories and/or

subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event

category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite

Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View

314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from

the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The user can also

access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add or remove categories

and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages 313-315 (col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Shutt's system in order to update

a user profile or file.

As to claim 10, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "where the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to another user's subscription list and the user may be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list".
Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members inthe group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group to Shutt's system in order to allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a security level access.

30. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Barnett and Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 9, Shutt does not explicilty teach the claimed limitation "wherein the subscription logic enables a user to subscribe to a matter file at a second level, wherein the subscription includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (col. 8,lines 35-55).

Robertson teaches modify record and put the modified record in a user record (col. 3, lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Roberson's teaching to Shutt's system in order to share information of a user to another user.

31. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Funk et al (or hereinafter "Funk") (US 20030115270 A1).

As to claim 11, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "an email logic to file emails in an appropriate matter file" as (fig. 14).

Funk teaches there is also a file for low priority emails being sent to AOL (file 311). Likewise, there is a folder for high priority emails being sent to Yahoo (file 312), a destination with a fast Receiving MTA, and low priority emails being sent to Yahoo (file 313). It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Funk's teaching to Shutt's system to store emails in a file for sending to another file or system.

32. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Rothkop (Us 2002/0049727).

As to claim 12, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation "the email logic to prompt a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder".

Rothkop teaches field 740 provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Shutt's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

33. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Mccotter.

As to claim 13, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file". Mccotter teaches arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Mccotter's teaching of arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file to Shutt's system in order to search documents in files of a folder quickly.

34. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt in view of Haahr and further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a matter file logic to arrange the matter file into an ontology based on attributes of the matter file".

Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching to Shutt's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in ahierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15, Shutt teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a refiling logic to simplify moving a plurality of objects into a matter folder by propagating the metadata to each of the objects in a hierarchical manner". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col.10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching to Shutt's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to

quickly grasp, the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object

in the hierarchy.

35. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shutt

in view of Haahr and and Dougherty et al (or hereinafter "Dougherty") (US

2002/0169650).

As to claim 16, Shutt teaches the claimed limitations: "a matter file including a

plurality of folders; each folder corresponding to a document type; setting up a matter

file in response to a user request, the matter file including the plurality of folders" as

(paragraphs [0020-0021]);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of

the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the

document type" as (figs. 22-23, paragraph [0084], paragraph [0129-0130]).

Shutt does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "having a plurality of

templates, each template designed to set up; a search component wherein user-

formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are

browser-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein

saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders".

Haahr teaches storing user query strings in a database (fig. 1). A user selects a

query and user will search documents using the previous queries (paragraph 0062, fig.

8).

Dougherty teaches library templates, each template designed to set up a file (paragraphs [0191-0192]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Dougherty teaches library templates, each template designed to set up a file and Haahr's teaching to Shutt's system in order to improve a user's current query, and allow a user to benefit and learn from previous queries having the same search results, users also learn from these previous queries by being able to accurately articulate more powerful queries, thus become more experienced with the art successful searching and further to create folder structures for association with a deal, a schedule of at least one meeting relating to a deal, and minutes from each meeting in order so that a user can search/retrieve information in folders easily and quickly.

As to claim 17, Shutt, Haahr and Dougherty disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, Dougherty further teaches the claimed limitations "the document inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into which the document is filed" as (paragraph [0193]).

As to claim 18, Shutt, Haahr and Dougherty disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 16, Dougherty further teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the inherited metadata is inferred" as (paragraph [0193]).

Conclusion

36.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Emens et al (US 6671681).

Contact Information

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571)

272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/   Cam Y Truong
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162   Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2162